

## **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached "Replacement Sheets" of drawings include changes to Figures 1-4.

The attached "Replacement Sheets," which include Figures 1-4, replace the original sheets including Figures 1-4.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets 1-4

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 and 18-22 are now pending in the application. Claims 16, 17, 23 and 24 have been cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

## **DRAWINGS**

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheets" for Figures 1-4, Applicants have removed the copy marks and improved the character of the lines, numbers and letters. The undersigned is in the process of having formal drawings prepared, but these were not completed as of the present date. However, it is believed that the drawings submitted herewith are clearly legible enough for examination purposes. Actual formal drawings will be submitted very shortly.

## **OBJECTION TO CLAIM 23**

Claim 23 stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have cancelled claim 23. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

## **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 2, 8, 9 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Krumes et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,465,142, hereinafter Krumes). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note independent claim 1 has been amended to include "the crew interface responsive to the infrared imaging system to enable a user to control the acquisition of images to acquire images on a direct flight path of a mobile platform

and to acquire images outside the direct flight path of the mobile platform.” Independent claim 8 has been amended to include “an infrared imaging system that acquires images in a direct path of a mobile platform and outside the direct path of the mobile platform based upon an input from an operator.” Similarly, independent claim 15 has been amended to include “a control device manually operable by a user . . . an infrared imaging system responsive to the control device that acquires images based on the input from the control device.” Applicants respectfully assert these features as claimed are not taught nor suggested by Krumes.

Krumes appears to merely disclose an obstacle sensing mechanism which emits an annular scanning beam from a fixed point on a helicopter (col. 3 and 4). Krumes does not mention whatsoever a system which is capable of receiving an input from an operator to enable the operator to effectively “steer” the infrared sensing system to acquire images outside the direct flight path of the mobile platform. This feature is not shown or suggested in Krumes. Accordingly, Applicants assert independent claims 1, 8 and 15 are patentable and in condition for allowance. In addition, as claims 2-7, 9-14, 16 and 17 each depend from either independent claims 1, 8 or 15, these claims are also believed to be patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 3, 7, 10 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krumes in view of Choate et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,422,828). Claims 4, 5, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krumes et al. and Choate et al. in view of Demaine et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,015,235).

Claims 6 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krumes et al. in view of Lyke (U.S. Pat. No. 6,215,327). Claims 17 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zheng et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,456,226 B1, hereinafter Zheng) and Raimondi et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,267,562, hereinafter Raimondi) in view of Bhanu et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,128,874). Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zheng and Raimondi in view of Choate et al. Claims 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zheng and Raimondi in view of Demaine et al. Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zheng and Raimondi in view of Lyke. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants note claims 3-7, 10-14, 19 and 20-22 each depend from independent claims 1, 8, 15 or 18. As stated previously, Applicants believe claims 1, 8, 15 and 18 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants believe claims 3-7, 10-14, 19 and 20-22 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Claim 17 has been cancelled. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 16, 18 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zheng in view of Raimondi. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 18 has been amended to include “acquiring an image based on a positioning input from a control device manually operated by an operator.” Claims 16 and 23 have been cancelled. Applicants respectfully assert Zheng and Raimondi, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest Applicants’ invention as claimed.

At best, Zheng appears merely to disclose a system for predicting turbulence for an aircraft by monitoring the weather patterns along only a small fixed area of the flight path (col. 6). Zheng is silent as to acquiring images based on an input from an operator and further teaches away from such a feature by stating that an advantage of his system is that it “takes advantage of all the information it can get from the ground-based system.” (col. 6, lines 61-62). Raimondi appears to disclose a lock-on launch system for artillery which acquires images of an entire area and then utilizes a crew chief to determine if the target is brush or rocks. Thus, the system of Raimondi also fails to teach or suggest a system which acquires images “based on an input from a control device manually operable by an operator.” Applicants further assert it would not be obvious to combine the teachings of the lock-on launch system for artillery of Raimondi with a system for detecting aircraft turbulence taught by Zheng. Thus, as neither Zheng nor Raimondi, either alone or in combination, teach Applicants’ invention as claimed, Applicants respectfully assert independent claims 16 and 18 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 28, 2005

By:   
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686  
Erica K. Schaefer, Reg. No. 55,861

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MDE/EKS/ps